arXiv:1210.6383v1 [math.CA] 23 Oct 2012

COMBINING RIESZ BASES

GADY KOZMA AND SHAHAF NITZAN

1. Introduction

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be some set, and $f \in L^2(S)$. How can one represent f as a combination of exponentials? Ideally, one would like to find a sequence $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the functions $\{e^{i\langle\lambda,t\rangle}\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(S)$. Such an object would give each f a unique representation as $f(t) = \sum c_\lambda e^{i\langle\lambda,t\rangle}$, and the coefficients would be easy to calculate. Unfortunately, orthonormal bases of exponentials are not easy to come by. It goes back to Fuglede [5] that even the ball in two or more dimensions does not enjoy an orthogonal basis of exponentials. The reason is that orthogonality is too strong a requirement, it requires that each couple of exponentials have their difference in the zero set of $\widehat{\mathbb{1}_S}$ (a Bessel function, in the case of the ball). See also [6, 8, 28, 14, 27]. A similar statement holds for some simply constructed subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, even the union of as few as two disjoint intervals may not admit an orthogonal basis of exponentials, see e.g. [9].

If one cannot find an orthonormal basis, a Riesz basis is the second best (see §2 for precise definitions). A Riesz basis also gives each function a unique representation $f(t) = \sum c_\lambda e^{i\langle\lambda,t\rangle}$ in a stable manner. Our understanding of the existence of Riesz bases of exponentials is still lacking. On the one hand, there are relatively few examples in which it is known how to construct a Riesz basis of exponentials. On the other hand, we know of no example of a set S of positive measure for which a Riesz basis of exponentials can be shown not to exist. In particular the question is not settled for the ball in two or more dimensions.

In this paper we prove the following.

Theorem. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite union of intervals. Then there exists a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that the functions $\{e^{i\lambda t}\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ form a Riesz basis in $L^2(S)$. Moreover, if $S \subseteq [0, 2\pi]$ then Λ may be chosen to satisfy $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.*

Interest in Riesz bases of exponentials for finite unions of intervals has its roots in practical applications to sampling of band-limited signals, and the first partial results came from there. Thus Kohlenberg [13] solved the case of two intervals of equal length. Bezuglaya and Katsnelson [4] solved the case that the intervals have integer end points. Seip [26] did the general case of two intervals and a few subcases of three or more variables. Lyubarskii and Seip [20] give a well-written survey on the problem including a solution of the case that the intervals have equal lengths (but arbitrary positions), as well as a proof that a Riesz basis of exponential with *complex* λ always exists. An interesting approach based on *quasicrystals* [21] allowed to construct Riesz bases for additional families of unions of intervals, under an arithmetic condition on the lengths [15, 17]. A control-theory approach was investigated in [2, 3] and a reduction to inversions of convolution integral operators in [12, 19].

Due to the popularity the problem used to enjoy, the following conversation must have repeated in many places and times

STUDENT: Why is it difficult to construct a Riesz basis for two intervals? Say their lengths are α and β, can't you just take $(1/\alpha)\mathbb{Z}\cup(1/\beta)\mathbb{Z}$?
ADVISOR: Think of the case $\alpha=\beta$!
STUDENT: OK, but you can move one of the copies a little, and then the union forms a Riesz basis, right?
ADVISOR: How about the case that α and β are rationally independent? Then no matter how you move two copies, the union is not even separated.
STUDENT: Right, just moving will not work in this case. But we can still use the Paley-Wiener stability theorem to perturb each one a little (so it's still a Riesz basis) in such a way that when you take the union it will be separated.
ADVISOR: But how do you show that this is a Riesz basis for the union?
STUDENT: Eh...

(see §2 for Paley-Wiener's stability theorem and the role of separatedness). The advisor probably knew that the union of two Riesz basis for two intervals is not necessarily a Riesz basis for the union, even if they are separated. A simple example comes from taking $\{\dots,-1\frac{3}{4},-\frac{3}{4},0,\frac{3}{4},1\frac{3}{4},2\frac{3}{4},\dots\}$ which is *not* a Riesz basis for $[0,2\pi]$ by Kadec [10], and noting that taking the even entries in the series gives a Riesz basis for $[0,\pi]$ while the odd entries form a Riesz basis for $[\pi,2\pi]$, both, again, by the Kadec $\frac{1}{4}$-rule. Nevertheless, the crux of our proof, proved in §3 below, is that under certain conditions, one can actually take the union and get a Riesz basis.

Before embarking with the details, we wish to draw the reader's attention to an interesting connection between the problem of finding *some* Riesz basis of exponentials on a complicated set, and characterizing Riesz bases of exponentials on a *single* interval. For example, Seip [26] translates the problem of finding a Riesz basis for two intervals to the problem of finding a Riesz basis of $[0,1]$ which is a subset of $\alpha\mathbb{Z}$ for some $\alpha<1$; and [15, 17] reduce the problem to asking whether certain arithmetic sets are Riesz bases for a single interval. The case of a single interval is amenable to techniques from complex analysis, leading to deep results by Kadec [10], Katsnelson [11] Avdonin [1] and Pavlov [25, 7]. Our approach also relies on a reduction to a single interval. However, in the interest of self-containment, we will give a proof that does not use these results, only the Paley-Wiener stability theorem (see §2).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Systems of vectors in Hilbert spaces.** Let H be a separable Hilbert space. A system of vectors $\{f_n\} \subseteq H$ is called a *Riesz basis* if it is the image, under a bounded invertible operator, of an orthonormal basis. This means that $\{f_n\}$ is a Riesz basis if and only if it is complete in H and satisfies the following inequality for all sequences $\{a_n\} \in l^2$,

$$c\sum|a_n|^2 \le \|\sum a_n f_n\|^2 \le C\sum|a_n|^2, \tag{1}$$

where c and C are some positive constants. A system $\{f_n\} \subseteq H$ which satisfies condition (1), but is not necessarily complete, is called a *Riesz sequence.*

A simple duality argument shows that $\{f_n\}$ is a Riesz basis if and only if it is minimal (i.e. no vector from the system lies in the closed span of the rest) and satisfies the following inequality for every $f \in H$,

$$c\|f\|^2 \le \sum|\langle f, f_n\rangle|^2 \le C\|f\|^2 \tag{2}$$

where c and C are some positive constants (in fact, the same constants as in (1)). A system $\{f_n\} \subseteq H$ which satisfies condition (2), but is not necessarily minimal, is called a *frame.*

In particular, this discussion implies the following:

Lemma 1. A system of vectors in a Hilbert space is a Riesz basis if and only if it is both a Riesz sequence and a frame.

If $\{f_n\}$ is a Riesz basis then there exists a *dual system* g_n with $\langle f_n, g_m\rangle = \mathbb{1}_{\{n=m\}}$ and $\|g_n\| \le C$. Indeed, if $\{\phi_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis in H and $T : H \mapsto H$ is a bounded invertible operator which satisfies $T\phi_n = f_n$ then the system $g_n := (T^*)^{-1}\phi_n$ has the required properties.

2.2. **Density and systems of exponentials.** We give a short and partial review of results connecting the properties of a sequence of exponentials and the density of its corresponding frequencies, due to Landau. These results will **not** be used in any of our proofs. But they are useful to keep in mind while reading Section 3 below.

Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_n\}$ be a *separated sequence* of real numbers, i.e.

$$|\lambda_n - \lambda_m| > \delta \qquad \forall n \ne m,$$

for some positive constant δ. Let us define the upper and lower densities

$$D^-(\Lambda) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{\min_{|I|=r}|\Lambda\cap I|}{r} \qquad D^+(\Lambda) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{\max_{|I|=r}|\Lambda\cap I|}{r}.$$

The sequence Λ is called *uniformly distributed* if $D^-(\Lambda) = D^+(\Lambda)$. In this case the common value is called the uniform density of Λ and denoted by $D(\Lambda)$.

Given a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of positive measure, consider the system of exponentials

$$E(\Lambda) = \{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}, \qquad e_\lambda(t) = e^{2\pi i\lambda t},$$

in the space $L^2(S)$. The results of Landau give necessary conditions, in terms of the density of Λ, for the system $E(\Lambda)$ to be a Riesz sequence or a frame in the space [16] (see also [22]).

Theorem (Landau)**.** *Let* Λ *and* S *be as above and assume that* Λ *is uniformly distributed and* S *is bounded.*

i. If $E(\Lambda)$ *is a Riesz sequence in* $L^2(S)$ *then* $D^+(\Lambda) \le |S|$*.*
ii. If $E(\Lambda)$ *is a frame in* $L^2(S)$ *then* $D^-(\Lambda) \ge |S|$*.*

In particular if $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis of $L^2(S)$ then Λ must be separated and uniformly distributed with $D(\Lambda) = |S|$.

Remark 1. If $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis for a bounded set, then Λ must be separated. Indeed, if $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ and $|\lambda - \mu| < \epsilon$ then there exists a corresponding element of the dual system g whose Fourier transform G satisfies $G(2\pi\lambda) = 1$ and $G(2\pi\mu) = 0$. This implies that $\|G'\|_\infty > 1/2\pi\epsilon$. Combining this with the fact that g is supported on a bounded set leads to a contradiction to the fact that the dual system has bounded norms.

On the other hand, for a bounded set S the separation condition on Λ implies that the system $E(\Lambda)$ satisfies the right inequality in (2) for the space $L^2(S)$ (equivalently, the right inequality in (1)). See, for example, [29].

2.3. **Stability of systems of exponentials.** In the first step of our construction we will use a theorem of Paley and Wiener regarding the stability of Riesz bases of exponentials over single intervals [24]. For the completeness of the paper we add a short proof of the theorem, which is applicable also for general spectra.

Theorem (Paley & Wiener)**.** *Let* $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ *be a bounded set of positive measure and* Λ *be a sequence of real numbers such that* $E(\Lambda)$ *is a Riesz basis in* $L^2(S)$*. Then there exists a constant* $\eta = \eta(S, \Lambda)$ *such that if a sequence* $\Gamma = \{\gamma_n\}$ *satisfies*

$$|\lambda_n - \gamma_n| < \eta \qquad \forall n$$

then $E(\Gamma)$ *is also a Riesz basis in* $L^2(S)$*.*

Proof. It is well known (and easy to check) that if $\{f_n\}$ is a Riesz basis in a Hilbert space H then there exists some constant c such that every sequence $\{g_n\} \subseteq H$ which satisfies

$$\sum |\langle f, f_n - g_n\rangle|^2 \le c\|f\|^2 \qquad \forall f \in H \tag{3}$$

is also a Riesz basis in H (see [29]).

To check this condition in our setting fix $f \in L^2(S)$ and denote its Fourier transform by F. Since S is bounded, F has a derivative on the real axis which is an image, under the Fourier transform, of some function in $L^2(S)$, say h. We have, $\|h\| \le C\|f\|$, for some constant C depending only on the diameter of S. Hence we get,

$$\sum |\langle f, e_{\lambda_n} - e_{\gamma_n}\rangle|^2 = \sum |F(2\pi\lambda_n) - F(2\pi\gamma_n)|^2$$

$$\leq (2\pi\eta)^2 \sum |F'(2\pi\xi_n)|^2 = (2\pi\eta)^2 \sum |\langle h, e_{\xi_n}\rangle|^2$$

where ξ_n is some number between λ_n and γ_n. Now, by the first part of Remark 1, Λ must be separated, and hence, if η is sufficiently small, so will be the sequence $\{\xi_n\}$. Using this with the second part of Remark 1 gives that the last expression is smaller than $C\eta^2\|h\|^2$. But $\|h\| \leq C\|f\|$, for some constant C depending only on the diameter of S. Hence, for small enough η the condition in (3) is fulfilled. $\square$

Remark 2. Both the theorem and its proof hold also for frames and Riesz sequences of exponentials.

Remark 3. In the case that $S = [0,1]$ and $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}$ The theorem holds for every constant $\eta < \frac{1}{4}$, and this is sharp (this is the Kadec-$\frac{1}{4}$ theorem already mentioned, see [18, 10]).

2.4. **Conventions.** We use $\{x\}$ to denote the fractional value of x i.e. the unique element in $(x + \mathbb{Z}) \cap [0,1)$. We use c and C to denote constants which depend on the system of exponentials under considerations but do not depend on other parameters. Their value may change from place to place and even inside the same formula. We will number them occasionally for clarity; numbered constants do not change their value. C will be used for constants sufficiently large and c for constants sufficiently small.

3. THE BASIC LEMMA

In this section we prove a general lemma which is used in several places throughout our construction. This lemma describes how one can get a Riesz basis of exponentials over a set S, given that there exist Riesz bases over some sets related to S.

Fix a positive integer N. Given a set $S \subset [0,1]$, define

$$A_n = \left\{t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{N}\right] : t + \frac{j}{N} \in S \text{ for exactly } n \text{ values of } j \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}\right\}$$

$$A_{\geq n} = \bigcup_{k=n}^{N} A_k \tag{4}$$

Lemma 2. If there exist $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_N \subseteq N\mathbb{Z}$ such that the system $E(\Lambda_n)$ is a Riesz basis in $L^2(A_{\geq n})$, then the system $E(\Lambda)$, where

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} (\Lambda_j + j),$$

is a Riesz basis in $L^2(S)$.

Proof. We will use Lemma 1 and show that $E(\Lambda)$ is both a frame and a Riesz sequence. Throughout the proof we will use the notation

$$e(t) = e_1(t) = e^{2\pi i t}.$$

Clearly, it is equivalent to prove the lemma under the assumptions that

$$\Lambda_n \subset N\mathbb{Z}+n \qquad \Lambda=\bigcup_{j=1}^{N}\Lambda_j$$

(but still requiring that Λ_n is a Riesz basis for $A_{\geq n}$ — recall that the property of being a Riesz basis is invariant to translations) which will make the notations a little shorter.

Frame. To show that $E(\Lambda)$ is a frame in $L^2(S)$ we need to show that for any $f\in L^2(S)$

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\langle f,e_\lambda\rangle|^2>c_1||f||^2$$

(the right inequality in the definition of a frame, (2), is satisfied because $S\subset[0,1]$ and $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}$). For $n\in\{1,\dots,N\}$, denote by f_n the restriction of f to

$$B_n=\Big\{t\in S: t+\frac{j}{N}\in S \text{ for exactly } n \text{ integer } j's\Big\}. \tag{5}$$

(A_n is the "folding" of B_n to $[0,\frac{1}{N}]$ i.e. cutting it to N pieces, translating each one to $[0,\frac{1}{N}]$ and taking a union). It is enough to show that for every $n=1,\dots,N$ we have

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\langle f,e_\lambda\rangle|^2\geq c\|f_n\|^2-\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\|f_k\|^2, \tag{6}$$

where c is a positive constant, not depending on f. Indeed, the inequalities in (6) imply that for any sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_n\}_{n=1}^N$ with $\sum\delta_n=1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\langle f,e_\lambda\rangle|^2&=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\delta_n\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\langle f,e_\lambda\rangle|^2\\ &\overset{(6)}{\geq}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\delta_n\Big(c\|f_n\|^2-\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\|f_k\|^2\Big)=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\Big(c\delta_n-\sum_{k=n+1}^{N}\delta_k\Big)\|f_n\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Denote the last constant by c_2 for clarity. We get that, if the sequence $\{\delta_n\}$ satisfies

$$\delta_n>\frac{2}{c_2}\sum_{k=n+1}^{N}\delta_k, \qquad \forall n\in\{1,\dots,N\}$$

(essentially it needs to decrease exponentially), then for $c_1=\frac{1}{2}c_2\min\delta_n$ we get that

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|\langle f,e_\lambda\rangle|^2\geq c_1\sum_{n=1}^{N}\|f_n\|^2=c_1\|f\|^2.$$

as needed.

Hence we need to show (6). Fix therefore some $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ until the end of the proof. Now, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$, $|x+y|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|x|^2 - |y|^2$. So,

$$|\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\Big|\Big\langle \sum_{k=n}^{N} f_k, e_\lambda \Big\rangle\Big|^2 - \Big|\Big\langle \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_k, e_\lambda \Big\rangle\Big|^2.$$

For brevity define $f_{\geq n} = \sum_{k=n}^{N} f_k$. Summing over $\lambda \in \Lambda$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 - \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\Big|\Big\langle \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_k, e_\lambda\Big\rangle\Big|^2 \\ &\overset{(*)}{\geq} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 - \Big\|\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_k\Big\|^2 \\ &\overset{(**)}{=} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|f_k\|^2\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ is because $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $(**)$ since f_k have disjoint supports. Hence, to obtain (6) it remains to show that

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 \geq c\|f_n\|^2 \tag{7}$$

where c is a positive constant not depending on f.

Recall that $\Lambda = \cup\Lambda_j$ and $\Lambda_j \subseteq N\mathbb{Z} + j$. For any $\lambda \in N\mathbb{Z} + j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle &= \int_0^1 f_{\geq n}(t)\overline{e_\lambda}(t)\,dt = \int_0^{1/N} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} f_{\geq n}\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big)e_{-\lambda}\Big(t+\frac{l}{N}\Big)\,dt \\ &= \int_0^{1/N} h_j(t)e(-\lambda t) = \langle h_j, e_\lambda\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where

$$h_j(t) = \mathbb{1}_{A_{\geq n}}(t)\cdot\sum_{l=0}^{N-1} f_{\geq n}\Big(t+\frac{l}{N}\Big)e\Big(-\frac{jl}{N}\Big).$$

Fix $j \leq n$. Since Λ_j is a Riesz basis for $A_{\geq j}$ and since h_j is supported on $A_{\geq n} \subset A_{\geq j}$ we have

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_j} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 \overset{(8)}{=} \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_j} |\langle h_j, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 \geq c||h_j||^2 \tag{9}$$

where c is the Riesz constant of Λ_j. Summing over j gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_j} |\langle f_{\geq n}, e_\lambda\rangle|^2 \geq \\ &\overset{(9)}{\geq} c\sum_{j=1}^{n} ||h_j||^2 \geq c\sum_{j=1}^{n} ||h_j\cdot\mathbb{1}_{A_n}||^2. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

For every particular $t \in A_n$ the values of $\{h_j(t)\}_j$ are given by applying the $n \times N$ matrix $L = \{e(-jl/N)\}_{j,l}$ to the vector $\{f_{\geq n}(t + l/N)\}_l$. Now, $t \in A_n$ so exactly n different values of this vector are non-zero. Considering only these values we may think of L as an $n \times n$ Vandermonde matrix which is invertible because the numbers $e(-l/N)$ are disjoint. Let C be a bound for the norm of the inverse over all such $n \times n$ sub-matrices of L. We get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} |h_j(t)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \Big| f_{\geq n}\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big)\Big|^2$$

which we integrate over $t \in A_n$ to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} ||h_j \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_n}||^2 \geq c \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \int_{A_n} \Big| f_{\geq n}\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big)\Big|^2 dt = c||f_n||^2.$$

With (10) we get (7), which in turn gives (6) and finally that Λ is a frame.

Riesz sequence. We now show that $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(S)$, i.e. that for any sequence $a_\lambda \in l^2(\Lambda)$,

$$\Big\| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big\|^2 \geq c \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |a_\lambda|^2$$

(again, the other inequality in (1) follows from $S \subset [0,1]$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$). As in the first part, it is enough to show that for every $n = 1, \ldots, N$ we have

$$\int_S \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big|^2 \geq c \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} |a_\lambda|^2 - \sum_{j=n+1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} |a_\lambda|^2. \tag{11}$$

To this end choose $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big|^2 dt &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_S \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big|^2 - \int_S \Big| \sum_{j=n+1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_S \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda \Big|^2 - \sum_{j=n+1}^{N} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} |a_\lambda|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to $S \subset [0,1]$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Denote for brevity

$$f = \mathbb{1}_S \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda$$

and get that to prove (11) it remains to show that

$$\int_S |f(t)|^2 \, dt \geq c \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} |a_\lambda|^2. \tag{12}$$

As in the previous case, we need to translate the problem to $A_{\geq n}$ in order to use the assumption of the lemma. Fix therefore some $t \in A_{\geq n}$ and some $l \in \{0, \ldots, N-1\}$ such that $t + l/N \in S$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} f\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e\Big(\lambda t + \frac{\lambda l}{N}\Big) = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} e(jl/N) \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda(t) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is because $\Lambda_j \subset N\mathbb{Z} + j$. Again we see that the vector $\{f(t + l/N)\}_l$ (where l runs only over the values for which $t + l/N \in S$, say there are k such values) is given by applying the $k \times n$ matrix $\{e(jl/N)\}_{l,j}$ to the vector $\big\{ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda(t) \big\}_j$. Again this matrix has full rank because $k \geq n$ and any $n \times n$ minor is an invertible Vandermonde matrix. Set C to be a bound for the norms of the inverses over all these minors and get, for all $t \in A_{\geq n}$,

$$\sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \Big| f\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big) \Big|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_j} a_\lambda e_\lambda(t) \Big|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C} \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} a_\lambda e_\lambda(t) \Big|^2. \tag{13}$$

Integrate over t and get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S |f(t)|^2 \, dt \geq \int_{B_{\geq n}} |f(t)|^2 \, dt &= \int_{A_{\geq n}} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \Big| f\Big(t + \frac{l}{N}\Big) \Big|^2 dt \\ &\overset{(13)}{\geq} \frac{1}{C} \int_{A_{\geq n}} \Big| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} a_\lambda e_\lambda(t) \Big|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $E(\Lambda_n)$ is a Riesz basis over $A_{\geq n}$, this is $\geq c \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} |a_\lambda|^2$. This shows (12), hence (11), and completes the proof. □

Let us remark that a similar approach of dissection and translation was used in [23].

4. Single intervals

In this section we use lemma 2 to obtain some corollaries regarding Riesz bases of exponentials over single intervals. Our construction for Riesz bases over finite unions of intervals will be done in much the same way. We end this section with Claim 2, which is a simplified version of our main result: it states that our main result holds in the "generic" case.

The following Lemma was proved in [26] using Avdonin's theorem. As promised, we give an elementary proof.

Lemma 3. Let $S \subseteq [0, 1]$ be an interval. Then there exists a sequence $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis for $L^2(S)$.

Before starting with the proof of lemma 3, let us do a special case.

Claim 1. Let η be a constant satisfying the conditions of the Paley-Wiener stability theorem for $S = [0, 1]$ and the Riesz basis $\mathbb{Z}$. There exists a sequence $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis for $L^2[0, \eta]$.

Proof. Applying an appropriate transformation from $L^2[0, 1]$ to $L^2[0, \eta]$, we find that the system $E((1/\eta)\mathbb{Z})$ is a Riesz basis (in fact, an orthogonal basis) over $[0, \eta]$. Moreover, the Paley-Wiener stability theorem implies that if $\Lambda = \{\lambda_n\}$ satisfies $|n/\eta - \lambda_n| \le 1$ then $E(\Lambda)$ is also a Riesz basis over $[0, \eta]$. This gives the claim. $\square$

Proof of lemma 3. We may assume that $S = [0, b]$. Fix η as in Claim (1). First, we note that there exists a number N such that $\{Nb\} \le \eta$ (recall that $\{\cdot\}$ denotes the fractional value). Indeed, this is clear if b is rational and follows from the density of $\{Nb\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ if b is not rational.

Recall the definition of the sets $A_{\ge n}$, (4). For our S and N, the sets $A_{\ge n}$ are simply

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\ge n} &= \left[0, \frac{1}{N}\right] && 1 \le n \le \lfloor Nb \rfloor \\ A_{\ge \lfloor Nb \rfloor + 1} &= \left[0, \frac{\{Nb\}}{N}\right] && \\ A_{\ge n} &= \emptyset && \lfloor Nb \rfloor + 2 \le n \le N. \end{aligned}$$

To apply lemma 2 we need to demonstrate Riesz bases in $N\mathbb{Z}$ for these sets. For $[0, 1/N]$ we take $N\mathbb{Z}$ itself, and for $[0, \{bN\}/N]$ we can apply claim 1 (after scaling by N) since $\{bN\} < \eta$. Hence lemma 2 applies and we are done. $\square$

In particular, Lemma 3 implies that for "most" of the sets S, which are finite unions of intervals, there exists a Riesz basis of exponentials. We add a short proof for this claim, as it is simpler than the proof of our general result:

Claim 2. Let $S \subset [0, 1]$ be a finite union of intervals $S = \cup_{j=1}^{L} [a_j, b_j]$. If the numbers $\{a_1, \dots, a_L, b_1, \dots, b_L, 1\}$ are linearly independent over the rationals then there exists a sequence $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis over S.

Proof. Due to linear independence, the vectors $(\{Na_1\}, \dots, \{Na_L\}, \{Nb_1\}, \dots, \{Nb_L\})$ are dense in $[0, 1]^{2L}$ and in particular there exists an N such that

$$\{Na_1\}, \dots, \{Na_L\} < \frac{1}{2} < \{Nb_1\}, \dots, \{Nb_L\}.$$

Now, the function $\Phi(t) = |\{j : t + j/N \in S\}|$ increases at every $\{Na_i\}/N$ and decreases at every $\{Nb_i\}/N$ so the restrictions above mean that it is increasing on $[0, 1/2N]$ and decreasing on $[1/2N, 1/N]$. In particular $A_{\ge n} = \{t : \Phi(t) \ge n\}$ is an interval for every n. We use lemma 3 to find a Riesz basis in $\mathbb{Z}$ for each $NA_{\ge n}$, rescale to get a Riesz basis in $N\mathbb{Z}$ for $A_{\ge n}$ and finally apply lemma 2 to construct a Riesz basis for S. $\square$

5. Finite union of intervals

5.1. **Auxiliary results.** The proof of the theorem in the general case requires some understanding of the possible orders $\{Na_i\}$ may hold (compare to the proof of claim 2). First, we mention a simple observation.

Claim 3. Let L be a positive integer and $a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_L$, $b_1 \leq \cdots \leq b_L \in [0,1]$ be $2L$ numbers. Set

$$\Phi(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathbb{1}_{[0,b_l]}(t) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathbb{1}_{[a_l,1]}(t) \qquad A_{\geq n} = \Phi^{-1}[n, 2L]; \quad 1 \leq n \leq 2L.$$

Then the sets $A_{\geq n}$ are all unions of at most L intervals (when considered cyclically). Moreover, if there exists some n such that $A_{\geq n}$ is a union of exactly L intervals then the sequences a_l and b_l interlace, i.e. either $a_1 \leq b_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots$ or $b_1 \leq a_1 \leq b_2 \leq \cdots$

Proof. The function Φ increases only in the a_l and decreases only in the b_l. Hence each set $A_{\geq n}$ is a union of cyclic intervals of the form $[a_l, b_j]$, $1 \leq l, j \leq L$. Since there are only $2L$ potential end-points, the sets $A_{\geq n}$ are all unions of at most L intervals.

Assume that the sequences do not interlace. This means that, for some $1 \leq l < L$, no b_j lies in the interval $[a_l, a_{l+1}]$. It follows that a set $A_{\geq n}$ which contains an interval with with left point at a_l, does not contain an interval with left point at a_{l+1}. Hence, the sets $A_{\geq n}$ are all unions of at most $L-1$ intervals. ☐

With claim 3, it is natural to investigate interlacement. Let us state our main claim.

Lemma 4. Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_L\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then there exist infinitely many $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that no element of the form $\{Na\}$, $a \in A$ lies strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$.

Again, the term "between" is to be understood cyclically. Since we do not make a claim about the order of $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$ then the lemma should be understood to mean that when you remove from the circle $\mathbb{T}$ the points $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$, one of the remaining intervals is empty of points of the form $\{Na\}$, $a \in A$.

Since the proof of Lemma 4 is rather technical we postpone it to the next section.

5.2. **Proof of the main result.** We are now ready to prove the theorem.

Proof. We prove the "moreover clause" of the theorem i.e. assume that $S \subset [0,1]$ and find a $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E(\Lambda)$ is a Riesz basis for S. We use induction on L, the number of intervals S is constructed of. The case $L = 1$ was checked in Lemma 3. Assume that the theorem holds for all positive integers smaller then L. Denote $S = \cup_{l=1}^{L} [a_l, b_l]$. By lemma 4 there exist arbitrarily large N such that there are no elements of the form $\{Nb_l\}$ strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$, when considered cyclically. This implies that the sequences $\{Na_l\}$ and $\{Nb_l\}$ do not interlace. Require also that N is so big that every interval $[a_l, b_l]$ contains at least one element of the form k/N.

Examine now the sets $A_{\geq n}$. Because each interval $[a_l, b_l]$ contains an element of $\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{Z}$, then $[a_l, b_l]$ is partitioned into translates of $[\{Na_l\}/N, 1/N]$, $[0, \{Nb_l\}/N]$ and $[0, 1/N]$. We now apply claim 3 with

$$a_i^{\text{claim 3}} = \{Na_i\} \qquad b_i^{\text{claim 3}} = \{Nb_i\}$$

and get that the $A_{\geq n}^{\text{claim 3}}$ have at most $L-1$ intervals. But each $A_{\geq n}$ is $\frac{1}{N}\times$ some $A_{\geq n}^{\text{claim 3}}$ (not necessarily the same n, because of the pieces $[0, 1/N]$, but this is not important). Hence, we may apply our inductive assumption to construct Riesz bases in $\mathbb{Z}$ for all the sets $NA_{\geq n}$, rescale to get Riesz bases in $N\mathbb{Z}$ for the sets $A_{\geq n}$ and then apply Lemma 2 to finish the induction. ☐

In a similar way one can show the following corollaries of the theorem, we omit the proofs.

Corollary 1. Let $S \subseteq [0,1]$ be a union of L intervals and fix $N > 0$. Assume that $m/N \leq |S| < (m+1)/N$ where m is a positive integer. Then Λ of theorem 1 can be chosen to satisfy

$$\cup_{j=0}^{m-2L-1}(N\mathbb{Z}+j) \subseteq \Lambda \subseteq \cup_{j=0}^{m+2L}(N\mathbb{Z}+j).$$

Corollary 2. Let $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq S_K \subseteq [0,1]$ be a family of sets, all of which are finite unions of intervals. Then there exist sequences $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \ldots \subseteq \Lambda_K \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E(\Lambda_k)$ is a Riesz basis over S_k.

Remark 4. It is not difficult to check that the Riesz bases we construct all have bounded discrepancy, namely, if the measure of S is α, then the Riesz basis Λ we construct has the property that for any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\big||\Lambda \cap I| - \alpha|I|\big| \leq C.$$

Of course, this is due to us eventually relying on Paley-Wiener stability. Riesz bases constructed by applying Paley-Wiener to scaled copies of $\mathbb{Z}$ have bounded discrepancy, and this property is preserved throughout.

6. Proof of Lemma 4

In this section we prove lemma 4. With this the proof of the theorem will be complete.

We will use the following pseudometric on $\mathbb{R}$

$$d(x,y) = \min_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}\{|x-y+n|\}.$$

By definition, for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$d(a,b) \leq \{a-b\}. \tag{14}$$

Proof. We divide into three cases according to $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1, a_1, a_2\})$.

case 1: If a_1 and a_2 are both rational, then there exists an integer N_0 such that $\{N_0 a_1\} = \{N_0 a_2\} = 0$ and there cannot be anything strictly between them. To get infinitely many such N, take any $N \in N_0\mathbb{N}$. So this case is trivial.

case 2: Assume $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1, a_1, a_2\}) = 2$. Then there exist rationally independent numbers $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k$ and a $Q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a_i = m_{i,1}\xi_1 + \frac{p_i}{Q} \qquad i = 1, 2$$

and

$$a_i = \frac{p_i}{Q} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} m_{i,j}\xi_j \qquad i = 3, ..., L, \tag{15}$$

where $m_{i,j}$ and p_i are integers. Finding this representation is easy. We first choose ξ'_1 such that $\{1, \xi'_1\}$ is a basis for $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1, a_1, a_2\}$. We then complete $\{1, \xi'_1\}$ to a basis for $\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1, a_1, \ldots, a_L\}$ using some $\xi'_2, \ldots, \xi'_k$ (possibly zero of those). Finally we define $\xi_i = \xi'_i/M$ for some M which will guarantee that all $m_{i,j}$ are integers.

Denote for brevity $\xi = \xi_1$ and $m_{i,1} = m_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, L$. Now, if $m_1 = m_2$ then we can take the N in the formulation of the lemma to be any value in $Q\mathbb{N}$ and finish as in the first case, so we assume that $m_1 \neq m_2$.

Let p be some sufficiently large prime number. We will specify p later, (depending on the a_i). Since $m_1 \neq m_2$ we may define

$$s \equiv (m_1 - m_2)^{-1} \mod p. \tag{16}$$

Finally, let B be some small ball in $[0, 1]^{k-1}$ that will be specified later (depending on the a_i and on p).

We may now choose N. We choose it to satisfy that following requirements

a. $|\{N\xi\} - \frac{s}{p}| \leq \frac{1}{p^2}$.
b. $(\{N\xi_2\}, \ldots, \{N\xi_k\}) \in B$
c. Q divides N

Fulfilling all these requirements is easy. First find some N' such that $|\{N'\xi\} - s/Qp| \leq 1/Qp^2$ and $(\{N'\xi_2\}, \ldots, \{N'\xi_k\}) \in B/Q$ using the rational independence of the ξ_i. Then define $N = QN'$. Clearly this also gives infinitely many such N.

Next write requirement (a) as

$$N\xi = M + \frac{s}{p} + \epsilon \qquad |\epsilon| \leq \frac{1}{p^2} \tag{17}$$

for some integer M. This gives for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\{Na_i\} = \Big\{Nm_i\xi + N\frac{p_i}{Q}\Big\} &\overset{(*)}{=} \{Nm_i\xi\} \qquad (18)\\ &\overset{(17)}{=} \Big\{m_i\Big(M + \frac{s}{p} + \epsilon\Big)\Big\} = \Big\{\frac{m_i s}{p} + m_i\epsilon\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ is because Q divides N. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(\{Na_1\},\{Na_2\}) &\le d\Big(\frac{m_1 s}{p},\frac{m_2 s}{p}\Big)+2|\epsilon|\max|m_i| \\ &\overset{(14)}{\le}\Big\{\frac{(m_1-m_2)s}{p}\Big\}+2|\epsilon|\max|m_i| \overset{(16)}{=} \frac{1}{p}+2|\epsilon|\max|m_i|. \end{aligned}$$

We need to show that, with an appropriate choice of p and B, there are no $\{Na_i\}$ strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$. We distinguish between two kinds of a_i, those whose representation in (15) is $m_i\xi+\frac{p_i}{Q}$ and those which have terms involving $\xi_2,\dots,\xi_k$.

Examine first $a_i=m_i\xi+\frac{p_i}{Q}$ for some $i\ge 3$. Then (18) applies equally and we get $\{Na_i\}=\{m_i s/p+m_i\epsilon\}$. We wish to compare to a_j for $j=1,2$. We make the first requirement from p that $p>2\max|m_i|$, and then either $m_i=m_j$ or $m_i\not\equiv m_j$ mod p. This gives that either $d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_j\})=0$ or

$$d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_j\})\ge d\Big(\frac{m_i s}{p},\frac{m_j s}{p}\Big)-2|\epsilon|\max|m_i|\ge\frac{1}{p}-2|\epsilon|\max|m_i|.$$

We increase the requirement from p to $p>8\max|m_{i,j}|$. With this and $|\epsilon|\le p^{-2}$ (17), it is easy to see that any $a_i=m_i\xi+\frac{p_i}{q_i}$ cannot have $\{Na_i\}$ strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$, as the distance between them is $\le\frac{5}{4p}$ while, if $\{Na_i\}\ne\{Na_1\},\{Na_2\}$ then it must be in distance $\ge\frac{3}{4p}$ from *both*.

We now move to the case that $a_i=\frac{p_i}{Q}+\sum m_{i,j}\xi_j$ with $m_{i,j}\ne 0$ for at least one $j\ge 2$, or, in other words, that $a_i\notin\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi\}$. For $x\in[0,1]$ and $\delta>0$ let $S_i(x,\delta)\subset[0,1]^{k-1}$ be the set of $(\eta_2,\dots,\eta_k)$ satisfying

$$d\Big(\sum_{j=2}^k m_{i,j}\eta_j,x\Big)\le\delta.$$

We now claim that

$$\operatorname{vol}(S_i(x,\delta))\le C_i\delta \tag{19}$$

where vol stands for the $(k-1)$-dimensional Lebesgue measure and where the constant C_i depends on $\{m_{i,j}:j=2,\dots,k\}$ but is independent of δ and x. To see (19) replace the cube $[0,1]^{k-1}$ in the definition of S_i with the ball $\{\sum\eta_j^2\le k-1\}$ (this can only increase the volume) and rotate so that the vector $(m_{i,j})_j$ becomes $(||m||,0,\dots,0)$. We get

$$\operatorname{vol}(S_i(x,\delta))\le\operatorname{vol}\left(\Big\{\eta:\sum_{j=2}^k\eta_j^2\le k-1, d(\eta_2||m||,x)\le\delta\Big\}\right)$$

The right-hand side is clearly bounded by $C_i\delta$, giving (19).

We require that $p\ge 4L\max C_i$ (recall that L is the number of a_i). This is the final requirements from p, and we may now fix its value. This condition implies that the set

$$S=\bigcup S_i\Big(\Big\{\frac{m_1 s}{p}-\frac{m_{i,1}s}{p}\Big\},\frac{2}{p}\Big);\qquad \text{over } i \text{ such that } a_i\notin\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi\}$$

has measure $\le \frac{1}{2}$. Hence we may choose some ball B in the complement of S. This is the definition of B (as promised p and B do not depend on N).

Now, let a_i be such that $m_{i,j}\neq 0$ for at least one $j\ge 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_1\}) &= d\Big(\Big\{\frac{m_{i,1}s}{p}+m_{i,1}\epsilon+\sum_{j=2}^{k} m_{i,j}\{N\xi_j\}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{m_1 s}{p}+m_1\epsilon\Big\}\Big)\\ &\ge d\Big(\Big\{\sum_{j=2}^{k} m_{i,j}\{N\xi_j\}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{m_1 s}{p}-\frac{m_{i,1}s}{p}\Big\}\Big)-2|\epsilon|\max|m_{i,j}|\\ &> \frac{2}{p}-2|\epsilon|\max|m_{i,j}|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\epsilon<1/p^2$ and $p>8\max_{i,j}|m_{i,j}|$ so finally we get $d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_1\})>\frac{7}{4p}$. This finishes case 2 since $d(\{Na_1\},\{Na_2\})<\frac{5}{4p}$ and therefore $\{Na_i\}$ cannot be between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$.

case 3: We are left with the case that $1,a_1$ and a_2 are rationally independent. As in the previous case, we find rationally independent numbers $\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= m_{1,1}\xi_1+\frac{p_1}{Q}\\ a_2 &= m_{2,2}\xi_2+\frac{p_2}{Q}\\ a_i &= \sum m_{i,j}\xi_j+\frac{p_i}{Q} \end{aligned}$$

With Q and all $m_{i,j}$ integers. Again denote $m_1=m_{1,1}$ and $m_2=m_{2,2}$. Let $p_1<p_2$ be two prime numbers, sufficiently large, to be specified later (there will be no restriction on the relation between them, as long as they are different). Using the Chinese reminder theorem we pick two integers r_1 and r_2 such that

$$r_1p_2-r_2p_1=1. \tag{20}$$

We make a (first) restriction on the size of p_1 and ask that $p_1>2\max|m_{i,j}|$. Next, we pick two integers s_1 and s_2 such that

$$m_js_j\equiv r_j \mod p_j;\qquad j=1,2 \tag{21}$$

Again let B be a small ball in $[0,1]^{k-2}$, to be specified later.

We now choose N to satisfy

a. $|\{N\xi_j\}-s_j/p_j|<(p_1p_2)^{-2}\quad j=1,2.$
b. $(\{N\xi_3\},\dots,\{N\xi_k\})\in B$.
c. Q divides N.

As in the previous case, infinitely many such N may be found since the ξ_i are independent over the rationales.

Write,

$$N\xi_j = M_j + s_j/p_j + \epsilon_j; \quad |\epsilon_j| < (p_1p_2)^{-2}, \qquad j = 1,2 \tag{22}$$

where M_j are integers. As before, this allows to write

$$\{Na_j\} = \Big\{\frac{s_jm_j}{p_j} + \epsilon_jm_j\Big\}.$$

It follows that,

$$d(\{Na_1\},\{Na_2\}) \le d\Big(\Big\{\frac{s_1m_1}{p_1}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{s_2m_2}{p_2}\Big\}\Big) + \frac{2\max|m_i|}{(p_1p_2)^2}.$$

By (21), (14) and (20) we have

$$d\Big(\Big\{\frac{s_1m_1}{p_1}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{s_2m_2}{p_2}\Big\}\Big) \overset{(21)}{=} d\Big(\Big\{\frac{r_1}{p_1}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{r_2}{p_2}\Big\}\Big) \overset{(14)}{\le} \Big\{\frac{r_1}{p_1}-\frac{r_2}{p_2}\Big\} \overset{(20)}{=} \frac{1}{p_1p_2}.$$

So,

$$d(\{Na_1\},\{Na_2\}) \le \frac{1}{p_1p_2} + \frac{2\max|m_i|}{(p_1p_2)^2}. \tag{23}$$

We need to show that with an appropriate choice of p_1, p_2 and B no $\{Na_i\}$ lies strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$. Again we need to distinguish between $a_i \in \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi_1,\xi_2\}$ and other a_i's.

First, let $a_i = m_{i,1}\xi_1 + m_{i,2}\xi_2 + \frac{p_i}{Q}$. For a_j, $j = 1,2$, we can use (22) to write

$$\begin{aligned} d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_j\}) &= d\Big(\Big\{\frac{s_1m_{i,1}}{p_1} + \frac{s_2m_{i,2}}{p_2} + m_{i,1}\epsilon_1 + m_{i,2}\epsilon_2\Big\},\Big\{\frac{s_jm_j}{p_j} + m_j\epsilon_j\Big\}\Big) \\ &\ge d\Big(\Big\{\frac{s_1m_{i,1}}{p_1} + \frac{s_2m_{i,2}}{p_2}\Big\},\Big\{\frac{s_jm_j}{p_j}\Big\}\Big) - \frac{3\max|m_{i,j}|}{(p_1p_2)^2} \end{aligned}$$

For $j = 1$ we have

$$\Big(\frac{s_1m_{i,1}}{p_1} + \frac{s_2m_{i,2}}{p_2}\Big) - \Big(\frac{s_1m_1}{p_1}\Big) = \frac{s_1p_2(m_{i,1}-m_1) + s_2p_1m_{i,2}}{p_1p_2}.$$

Recall that $p_1 > 2\max|m_{i,j}|$ and p_1 does not divide s_1. This implies that the numerator divides p_1p_2 only if $m_{i,1} = m_1$ and $m_{i,2} = 0$. The case $j = 2$ is similar. We find that $d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_j\})$ is either 0 or $> 1/p_1p_2 - 3\max|m_{i,j}|/(p_1p_2)^2$.

This finishes the case $a_i \in \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi_1,\xi_2\}$. For p_1 sufficiently large we get $p_1p_2 > 12\max|m_{i,j}|$ and then either $\{Na_i\}$ is equal to one of $\{Na_1\}$, $\{Na_2\}$, or it is of distance $> \frac{3}{4}/p_1p_2$ from both of them. Since they are of distance $< \frac{7}{6}/p_1p_2$ one from the other, this means that $\{Na_i\}$ cannot be strictly between them.

The proof of the case $a_i \notin \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi_1,\xi_2\}$ is again similar to case 2, so we will be brief. Again we denote by $S_i(x,\delta)$ the set of all vectors $\eta \in [0,1]^{k-2}$ such that

$$d\Big(\sum_{j=3}^{k} m_{i,j}\eta_j, x\Big) \le \delta$$

and get from (19) that $S_i(x,\delta)$ has measure $\le C(\vec{m})\delta$, uniformly in x. We require that $p_1 \ge 2LC(\vec{m})$ (in addition to all previous requirements) and fix p_1 and p_2. This implies that the set

$$S = \bigcup S_i\Big(\frac{s_1(m_1 - m_{i,1})}{p_1} - \frac{s_2 m_{i,2}}{p_2}, \frac{2}{p_1 p_2}\Big); \qquad i \text{ such that } a_i \notin \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi_1,\xi_2\}$$

has measure $\le 1/p_2$. Choose B to be in the complement of S.

For any $a_i \notin \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{1,\xi_1,\xi_2\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &d(\{Na_i\},\{Na_1\}) \ge \\ &\ge d\Big(\Big\{\frac{s_1 m_{i,1}}{p_1} + \frac{s_2 m_{i,2}}{p_2} + \sum_{j=3}^{k} m_{i,j}\{N\xi_j\}\Big\}, \Big\{\frac{s_1 m_1}{p_1}\Big\}\Big) - \frac{3\max m_{i,j}}{(p_1p_2)^2} \\ &= d\Big(\Big\{\sum_{j=3}^{k} m_{i,j}\{N\xi_j\}\Big\}, \Big\{\frac{s_1(m_1 - m_{i,1})}{p_1} - \frac{s_2 m_{i,2}}{p_2}\Big\}\Big) - \frac{3\max m_{i,j}}{(p_1p_2)^2} \\ &\ge \frac{2}{p_1p_2} - \frac{1}{4p_1p_2} = \frac{7}{4p_1p_2} \end{aligned}$$

and again, this contradicts that $\{Na_i\}$ is strictly between $\{Na_1\}$ and $\{Na_2\}$ and finishes case 3, and the lemma. □

6.1. **Acknowledgements.** This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation.

References

[1] Sergei A. Avdonin, К вопросу о базисах Рисса из показательных функций в L^2 [Russian: On the question of Riesz bases of exponential functions in L^2], Vestnik Leningrad Univ. 13 (1974), 5–12. English translation in: Vestnik Leningrad Univ. Math. 7 (1979), 203–211.

[2] Sergei A. Avdonin and William Moran, *Sampling and interpolation of functions with multi-band spectra and controllability problems.* Optimal control of partial differential equations (Chemnitz, 1998), 43–51, Internat. Ser. Numer. Math., 133, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1999.

[3] Sergei A. Avdonin, Anna Bulanova and William Moran, *Construction of Sampling and Interpolating Sequences for Multi-Band Signals. The Two-Band Case.* Internat. J. Applied Math. Comput. Sci. 17:2 (2007), 143–156. Available at: `amcs.uz.zgora.pl`

[4] L. Bezuglaya and Victor E. Katsnel'son, *The sampling theorem for functions with limited multi-band spectrum.* Z. Anal. Anwendungen 12:3 (1993), 511–534.

[5] Bent Fuglede, *Commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators and a group theoretic problem*, J. Funct. Anal. 16:1 (1974), 101–121. Available at: `sciencedirect.com`

[6] ______, *Orthogonal exponentials on the ball.* Expo. Math. 19:3 (2001), 267–272. Available at: `sciencedirect.com`

[7] Sergey V. Hruščev, Nikolai K. Nikol'skii and Boris S. Pavlov, *Unconditional bases of exponentials and of reproducing kernels*, Complex analysis and spectral theory (Leningrad, 1979/1980), 214–335, Lecture Notes in Math. 864, Springer, Berlin, 1981. Available at: `springerlink.com`

[8] Alex Iosevich, Nets Katz and Terence Tao, *The Fuglede spectral conjecture holds for convex planar domains*. Math. Res. Lett. 10:5 (2003), 559–569. Available at: `intlpress`

[9] Alex Iosevich and Mihalis N. Kolountzakis, *Periodicity of the spectrum in dimension one*. Analysis and PDE, to appear. Available at: `arXiv:1108.5689`

[10] Mikahil Ĭ. Kadec', Точное значение постоянной Палея-Винера [Russian: The exact value of the Paley-Wiener constant]. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 155 (1964), 1253–1254. English translation in: Soviet Math. Doklady 5:2 (1964), 559-561.

[11] Victor E. Katsnel'son, О базисах из показательных функций в L^2 [Russian: Exponential bases in L^2]. Funkc. Anal. i Priložen. 5:1 (1971), 37–47. `mathnet.ru`. English translation in: Funct. Anal. and Appl. 5:1 (1971), 31–38. `springerlink.com`

[12] ———, *Sampling and interpolation for functions with multi-band spectrum: the mean-periodic continuation method*. Wiener-Symposium (Grossbothen, 1994), 91–132, Synerg. Syntropie Nichtlineare Syst., 4, Verlag Wiss. Leipzig, Leipzig, 1996.

[13] Arthur Kohlenberg, *Exact Interpolation of Band-Limited Functions*. J. Appl. Phys. 24:12 (1953), 1432–1436. Available at: `aip.org`

[14] Mihail N. Kolountzakis and Máté Matolcsi, *Tiles with no spectra*. Forum Math. 18:3 (2006), 519–528. Available at: `degruyter.com`, `arXiv:0406127`

[15] Gady Kozma and Nir Lev, *Exponential Riesz bases, discrepancy of irrational rotations and BMO*. J. Fourier Anal. and Appl. **17:5** (2011), 879–898. `springerlink.com`, `arXiv:1009.2188`

[16] Henry J. Landau, *Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions*. Acta Math. **117** (1967) 37–52. Available at: `springerlink.com`

[17] Nir Lev, *Riesz bases of exponentials on multiband spectra*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140:9 (2012), 3127–3132. Available at: `ams.org`, `arXiv:1101.3894`

[18] Norman Levinson, *Gap and Density Theorems*. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications, vol. 26. Amer. Math. Soc., New York, 1940.

[19] Yurii Lyubarskii and Ilya M. Spitkovsky, *Sampling and interpolation for a lacunary spectrum*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 126:1 (1996), 77–87. `cambridge.org`

[20] Yurii Lyubarskii and Kristian Seip, *Sampling and interpolating sequences for multiband-limited functions and exponential bases on disconnected sets*. J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 3:5 (1997), 597–615. Available at: `springerlink.com`

[21] Basarab Matei and Yves Meyer, *Simple quasicrystals are sets of stable sampling*. Complex Var. Elliptic Equ. 55:8–10 (2010), 947–964. Available at: `tandfonline.com`

[22] Shahaf Nitzan and Alexander Olevskii, *Revisiting Landau's density theorems for Paley-Wiener spaces*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 350:9–10 (2012), 509–512. `sciencedirect.com`

[23] Alexander Olevskii and Alexander Ulanovskii, *Interpolation in Bernstein and Paley-Wiener spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. 256:10 (2009), 3257–3278. `sciencedirect.com`

[24] Ramond E. A. C. Paley and Norbert Wiener, *Fourier transforms in the complex domain*. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications vol. 19. Amer. Math. Soc., New York, 1934.

[25] Boris S. Pavlov, Базисность системы экспонент и условие Макенхаупта [Russian: The basis property of a system of exponentials and the condition of Muckenhoupt]. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 247 (1979), 37–40. English translation in: Soviet Math. Dokl. 20 (1979), 655–659.

[26] Kristian Seip, *A simple construction of exponential bases in L^2 of the union of several intervals*. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. 38:1 (1995), 171–177. Available at: `cambridge.org`

[27] Robert S. Strichartz, *Mock Fourier series and transforms associated with certain Cantor measures*. J. Anal. Math. 81 (2000), 209–238. Available at: `springerlink`

[28] Terence Tao, *Fuglede's conjecture is false in 5 and higher dimensions*. Math. Res. Lett. 11:2 (2004), 251–258. Available at: `intlpress.com`

[29] Robert M. Young, *An introduction to nonharmonic Fourier series*. Revised first edition. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 2001.